

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 04/15/11

DEPT. 17

HONORABLE Richard E. Rico

JUDGE

A. ORTIZ

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

1

B. CHAVEZ, C.A.

Deputy Sheriff

S. ALMAGUER-MILLER

Reporter

8:30 am

BC384285

Plaintiff

S. SAMIMI, (X)

Counsel

R. CROCKETT, (X)

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT LLC ET AL

VS

Defendant

D. RILEY, (X)

YURI PLYAM ET AL

Counsel

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

JURY TRIAL

At 8:55 a.m.: Jury present and jury deliberations resumes.

At 8:58 a.m.: Jury buzzes with question re: readback of testimony jury deliberations continue.

The court and counsel confer re: Jury question concerning readback.

Parties stipulate that Court reporter may enter jury room to give readback to jurors.

At 9:52 a.m.: Court reporter enters jury room to give readback

At 10:43 a.m.: Jury has morning break.

At 11:05 a.m.: Jury returns from morning break.

Court reporter resumes readback

At 11:55 a.m.: Court reporter exits jury room and has completed readback.
Jury deliberations resume.

At 12:30 p.m.: Jury breaks for lunch.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 04/15/11

DEPT. 17

HONORABLE Richard E. Rico

JUDGE

A. ORTIZ

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

1

B. CHAVEZ, C.A.

Deputy Sheriff

S. ALMAGUER-MILLER

Reporter

8:30 am

BC384285

Plaintiff

S. SAMIMI, (X)

Counsel

R. CROCKETT, (X)

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT, LLC ET AL

VS

Defendant

D. RILEY, (X)

YURI PLYAM ET AL

Counsel

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

At 1:30 p.m. : Jury returns from lunch.
Jury deliberations resume.

At 1:31 p.m.: Jury buzzes with verdict.

at 1:52 p.m.: Court, counsel, parties and jury
present Verdict is read

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT, LLC Case No. BC384285
PLAINTIFF,

vs.

SPECIAL VERDICT

YURI PLYAM, an individual; NATASHA
PLYAM, an individual and DOES 1
through 50.

DEFENDANTS

We answer the question submitted to us as follows:

1. Did Yuri Plyam or Natasha Plyam breach their
fiduciary duties to Precision Development, LLC?

X Yes No

If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer
question 2. If you answered no, stop here, answer no
further questions, and have the presiding juror sign
and date this form.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 04/15/11

DEPT. 17

HONORABLE Richard E. Rico

JUDGE

A. ORTIZ

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

1

B. CHAVEZ, C.A.

Deputy Sheriff

S. ALMAGUER-MILLER

Reporter

8:30 am

BC384285

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT LLC ET AL
VS
YURI PLYAM ET AL

Plaintiff

S. SAMIMI, (X)

Counsel

R. CROCKETT, (X)

Defendant

D. RILEY, (X)

Counsel

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

2. Was the conduct of Yuri Plyam or Natasha Plyam a substantial factor is causing harm to Precision Development, LLC?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

3. Has Precision Development, LLC proven by clear and convincing evidence that Yuri or Natasha Plyam acted with malice, oppression or fraud?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Answer question 4.

4. What are Precision Development, LLC's damages from of fiduciary Duty?

TOTAL : \$10,100,000.00

Signed: Francine Doupe
PRESIDING JUROR # 9

Dated: 4/14/11

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT, LLC Case No. BC 384285
Plaintiff,

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 04/15/11

DEPT. 17

HONORABLE Richard E. Rico

JUDGE

A. ORTIZ

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

1

B. CHAVEZ, C.A.

Deputy Sheriff

S. ALMAGUER-MILLER

Reporter

8:30 am

BC384285

Plaintiff

S. SAMIMI, (X)

Counsel

R. CROCKETT, (X)

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT LLC ET AL
VS

Defendant

D. RILEY, (X)

YURI PLYAM ET AL

Counsel

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

VS.

SPECIAL VERDICT

YURI PLYAM, an individual;
NATASHA PLYAM, an individual and
DOES 1 through 50

DEFENDANTS

We answer the question submitted to us as follows:

1. Did James Del Negro make the following statement to
a person other than Yuri Plyam or Natasha Plyam?
Yuri Plyam stole the payroll money.

____ Yes ☒ No

If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer
question 2. If you answered no, stop here, answer no
further questions, and have the presiding juror sign
and date this form.

2. Did the person to whom the statment was made
reasonably understand that the statement was about
Yuri Plyan or Natasha Plyam?

____ Yes ____ No

If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer
question 3. If you answered no stop here, answer no
further questions, and have the presiding juror sign
and date this form.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 04/15/11

DEPT. 17

HONORABLE Richard E. Rico

JUDGE

A. ORTIZ

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

1

B. CHAVEZ, C.A.

Deputy Sheriff

S. ALMAGUER-MILLER

Reporter

8:30 am

BC384285

Plaintiff

S. SAMIMI, (X)

Counsel

R. CROCKETT, (X)

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT LLC ET AL
VS

Defendant

D. RILEY, (X)

YURI PLYAM ET AL

Counsel

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

3. Did this person reasonably understand the statement to mean that Yuri Plyam or Natasha Plyam had stolen the payroll money?

☐ YES ☐ No

If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop hear, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

4. Was the statement substantially true?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If your answer to question 4 is no, then answer question 5. If you answered yes, stop here, answer no further question, and have presiding jury sign and date this form.

5. Did James Del Negro fail to use reasonable care to determine the truth or falsity of the statement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If your ansewr to question 5 is yes, then answer question 6. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

05/12/11

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 04/15/11

DEPT. 17

HONORABLE Richard E. Rico

JUDGE

A. ORTIZ

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE
1

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

B. CHAVEZ, C.A.

Deputy Sheriff

S. ALMAGUER-MILLER

Reporter

8:30 am

BC384285

Plaintiff

S. SAMIMI, (X)

Counsel

R. CROCKETT, (X)

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT LLC ET AL

VS

Defendant

D. RILEY, (X)

YURI PLYAM ET AL

Counsel

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

ASSUMED DAMAGES

6. What are the damages you award Yuri Plyam or Natasha Plyam for the assumed harm to his reputation and for shame, morification, or hurt feelings? You must award at least a nominal sum

\$ _____

Regardless of your answer to question 6, answer question 7.

7. Has Yuri Plyam or Natasha Playm proved by clear and convincing evidence that James Del Negro acted with malice, oppression, or fraud?

_____ Yes _____ No

Signed: Francine Doupe
PRESIDING JUROR #9

Dated: 4/15/11

At 1:54 p.m. : Jury polled.

As to Special Verdict 1.

As to Question 1: Did Yuri Plyam or Natasha Plyam breach their fiduciary duties to Precision Development, LLC ? 12 Yes 0 No

05/12/11

MINUTES ENTERED 04/15/11 COUNTY CLERK
--

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 04/15/11

DEPT. 17

HONORABLE Richard E. Rico

JUDGE

A. ORTIZ

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

1.

B. CHAVEZ, C.A.

Deputy Sheriff

S. ALMAGUER-MILLER

Reporter

8:30 am

BC384285

Plaintiff

S. SAMIMI, (X)

Counsel

R. CROCKETT, (X)

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT LLC ET AL

VS

Defendant

D. RILEY, (X)

YURI PLYAM ET AL

Counsel

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

As to Question 2: Was the conduct of Yuri Plyam or Natasha Plyam a substantial factor in causing harm to Precision Development, LLC? 9 Yes and 3 No

As to Question 3: Has Precision Development, LLC proven by clear and convincing evidence that Yuri or Natasha Plyam acted with malice, oppression or fraud? 9 Yes 3 No

As to Question 4: What are Precision Development, LLC's damages from the breach of fiduciary duty?

Total: 10,100, 000 12 Yes 0 No

As to Special Verdict 2.

As to Question 1 only question answered.

1: Did James Del Negro make the following statement to a person other than Yuri Plyam or Natasha Plyam? Yuri Plyam stole the payroll money. 0 Yes 12 No.

At 1:56 p.m.: Jury is return to jury room

Outside the presence of the jury.

The court and counsel confer re: Bifurcated issue punitive damages.

Defense's motion for directed verdict.

05/12/11

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 04/15/11

DEPT. 17

HONORABLE Richard E. Rico

JUDGE

A. ORTIZ

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

1

B. CHAVEZ, C.A.

Deputy Sheriff

S. ALMAGUER-MILLER

Reporter

8:30 am

BC384285

Plaintiff

S. SAMIMI, (X)

Counsel

R. CROCKETT, (X)

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT LLC ET AL
VS

Defendant

D. RILEY, (X)

YURI PLYAM ET AL

Counsel

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

The court declines to rule on Directed Verdict at this time.

At 2:10 p.m.: Court, counsel, parties and all jurors present as heretofore, trial resumes as to bifurcated issue: punitive damages.

Barbara Gottlieb is sworn and testifies for the Plaintiff.

Exhibit for identification and admitted:

(203) Yuri and Natasha Plyam known assets

Plaintiff rests.

Natasha Plyam is sworn and testifies for the Defendant.

Jury instruction given.

Jury instruction filed.

Plaintiff's final argument.

Defendant's final argument.

Final Exhibit list filed.

At 2:44 p.m.: Jury returns to jury room; deliberations begins re: punitive damages.

05/12/11

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 04/15/11

DEPT. 17

HONORABLE Richard E. Rico

JUDGE

A. ORTIZ

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE
1

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

B. CHAVEZ, C.A.

Deputy Sheriff

S. ALMAGUER-MILLER

Reporter

8:30 am

BC384285

Plaintiff

S. SAMIMI, (X)

Counsel

R. CROCKETT, (X)

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT LLC ET AL
VS

Defendant

D. RILEY, (X)

YURI PLYAM ET AL

Counsel

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

At 3:12 p.m.: Jury buzzes with verdict

At 3:17 p.m.: Court, counsel, parties and jury
present. Verdict read.

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT, LLC
Plaintiff,

BC384285

vs

SPECIAL VERDICT

YURI PLYAM, an individual;
NATASHA PLYAM, and individual;
and DOES 1 through 50

DEFENDANTS

1. What amount of punitive damages, if any, do you
award Precison Development, LLC?

\$ 200,000

Signed: Francine Doupe
PRESIDING JUROR #9

Dated: 4/15/11

At 3:19 p.m.: Jury polled.

As to Special Verdict on Punitive Damages:

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 04/15/11

DEPT. 17

HONORABLE Richard E. Rico

JUDGE

A. ORTIZ

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

1

B. CHAVEZ, C.A.

Deputy Sheriff

S. ALMAGUER-MILLER

Reporter

8:30 am

BC384285

PRECISION DEVELOPMENT LLC ET AL
VS
YURI PLYAM ET AL

Plaintiff

S. SAMIMI, (X)

Counsel

R. CROCKETT, (X)

Defendant

D. RILEY, (X)

Counsel

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

As to question 1: What amount of punitive damages, if any, do you award Precision Development, LLC?

\$200,000 _11_ Yes 1 No

At 3:20 p.m.: Court thanks and excuses jurors from their service.

All verdicts filed this date.

Stipulation, Receipt and Order re: release of civil exhibits is filed this date.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE: 05/03/11

DEPT. 17

HONORABLE RICHARD E. RICO

JUDGE

A. ORTIZ

DEPUTY CLERK

HONORABLE
10

JUDGE PRO TEM

ELECTRONIC RECORDING MONITOR

B. CHAVEZ, C.A.

Deputy Sheriff

NONE

Reporter

8:30 am

BC447557

Plaintiff

Counsel

STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE
INSURANCE CO

NO APPEARANCES

VS

Defendant

Counsel

LA CHECKERED CAB COMPANY ET AL

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS:

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

Default judgment having been entered, the order to show cause re: entry of judgment set for 5/4/11 is advanced to this date and discharged.

Upon checking FPS and journals, the court finds that there are no jury fees on deposit.